Impediments to a Sustainable Recovery (Part II)

Objectives:

11.1 Lack of recovery planning

at the federal, state and

local level

11.2 Exam 2

Salience

- Disasters are low frequency, high magnitude events
 - Pre-disaster planning
 - Adaptive planning
- False sense of security
- Recovery planning and disaster experience
 - Mandated planning requirements
 - Reconstruction provisions
 - Failing to improve plans post-disaster
 - Adoption of mitigation measures

- Inter-governmental impediments
 - Poor coordination between local planners and emergency managers
 - Combined skills are critically important to crafting a sustainable recovery

- Lack of inter-departmental coordination has several negative effects
 - Planners may not participate in the recovery process
 - Community planning
 - Grant program management
 - Plan making
 - Local emergency managers
 - Response emphasis
 - Long-term recovery and reconstruction

- Emergency managers and recovery
 - Relationships with state and federal emergency management officials
 - Familiarity with the coordination of response and creation of disaster response plans
 - Preliminary damage assessments

- The benefits of recovery are not widely known
 - Current recovery system is dominated by a disconnected collection of recovery programs
 - The Federal Recovery Plan does not outline steps to affect a sustainable recovery
 - In the research community, recovery is the least understood aspect of emergency management
 - Ancedotal evidence of recovery planning benefits
 - Dissemination of research findings

- Government incentives are not provided to create recovery plans
 - Specific benefits include:
 - Federal recognition of states and local governments that develop plans meeting established standards
 - Clearly articulating the benefits of recovery planning to states and local governments via training and outreach
 - Providing an increased level of programmatic autonomy

- Governmental incentives are not provided to create recovery plans
 - Specific benefits may include:
 - Providing federal or state funding to develop recovery plans
 - Providing additional federal or state assistance to communities that have developed a recovery plan
 - Reducing the non-federal cost share in communities that have a disaster recovery plan in place

- Governments believe that the tasks associated with recovery are too costly, time consuming or technically challenging
 - Identification of post-disaster tasks
 - Planning as an ongoing process
 - Developing adequate training materials
- Capability
 - Federal government training

- Clear assignment of responsibilities
 - Local emergency management, recovery and mitigation
 - Poor communication between emergency managers and planners
 - Federal and state emphasis on grant management-related duties

The Results of Failing to Plan for Recovery

- Lack of pre-disaster planning
 - Reduced coordination of resources
 - Failing to identify complimentary community objectives
 - A slowed recovery and reconstruction
 - Failing to incorporate mitigation into post-disaster reconstruction

The Results of Failing to Plan for Recovery

- The lack of planning in the immediate aftermath of a disaster
 - Increased loss of life or injuries
 - Failure to obtain grant funding
 - Uncoordinated state and federal response

The Results of Failing to Plan for Recovery

- The lack of planning during long-term recovery
 - Replacing at-risk infrastructure
 - New construction in high hazard areas
 - Failing to implement local, state or federal changes in policy that impede sustainable recovery

Class Discussion

- Planning mandates versus incentives
 - Mandates
 - Pros
 - Recognized requirement with known penalties and benefits
 - Establish standard of performance
 - Government action
 - Cons
 - Unfunded mandates and inter-governmental conflict
 - Increased administrative staffing requirements

Class Discussion

- Planning mandates versus incentives
 - Incentives
 - Pros
 - Allows governments additional latitude to develop plans that meet local needs
 - May facilitate enhanced inter-governmental relationships
 - Cons
 - Limited participation
 - Plan quality may suffer

Class Discussion

- If plan mandates are established how do you propose to initiate and sustain the program?
- More specifically, what approach would you use to implement this program?
- Examples
 - Developing national training program
 - Establish specific recovery planning guidelines
 - Provide federal funding to develop recovery plans
 - Establish tangible benefits

Exam 2

- Vertical and horizontal integration
- Post-disaster decision making
- Key factors limiting sustainable disaster recovery
 - Role playing exercise
 - Case study exercise
- Most significant impediment to sustainable recovery

Exam 2

- Remarks
 - Take home exam
 - Due the following week
 - Clarifying exam questions
 - Discuss the weight of the exam

Exam 2

- Student instructions
 - Answer 3 of 5 questions
 - Answer question 3 or 4
 - Emphasize materials covered in the course
 - Typed and double spaced